

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of:  
HUI-JUNG WU, ET AL..

Docket: 30-4731 (4780) DIV-1

Serial Number: 09/841,453

Group Art Unit: 2829

Filed: April 24, 2001

Examiner: Asok K. Sarkar

For: USE OF MULTIFUNCTIONAL SI-BASED OLIGOMER/POLYMER FOR THE  
SURFACE MODIFICATION OF NANOPOROUS SILICA FILMS

FAX COVER SHEET

TO: Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

FAX NO.: (703) 308-7722

**FAX COPY RECEIVED**

SEP 18 2002

FROM: Richard S. Roberts  
Reg. No. 27941  
P.O. Box 484  
Princeton, New Jersey 08542  
(609) 921-3500

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

DATE: September 18, 2002

KINDLY DIRECT THIS COMMUNICATION TO:

EXAMINER : Asok K. Sarkar  
GROUP : 2829

NO. OF PAGES SENT INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET: 8

If all pages are not received, please call (609) 921-3500.

*P.2*  
*#10/Response*  
*9.25.02*  
*C Moore*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of:

HUI-JUNG WU, ET AL.

Docket: 30-4731 (4780) DIV-1

Serial Number: 09/841,453

Group Art Unit: 2829

Filed: April 24, 2001

Examiner: Asok K. Sarkar

For: USE OF MULTIFUNCTIONAL SI-BASED OLIGOMER/POLYMER FOR THE SURFACE MODIFICATION OF NANOPOROUS SILICA FILMS

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**FAX COPY RECEIVED**  
SEP 18 2002

Sir:

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

In response to the Office Action mailed June 20, 2002, please consider the following remarks.

REMARKS

The Examiner has subjected this application to restriction under 35 U.S.C. 121. The Examiner has formed two groups of claims, the Group I for claims 2-28 drawn to a dielectric film, and Group II for claim 29, drawn to a polymeric material. In a response filed on May 24, 2002, Applicants elected Group I for examination with traverse. The Examiner states in paragraph 1 of the Office Action that Applicants' election with traverse has been interpreted as an election without traverse because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the errors in the restriction requirement. It is respectfully asserted that the Examiner is incorrect. Applicants traversal and their arguments supporting the restriction requirement can be found in the response filed on May 24, 2002. It is further respectfully submitted that while the Examiner does have the power to accept or reject arguments of traversal as persuasive or not persuasive, it is not within the power of the Examiner to reject such arguments as unresponsive and deem the